1 2 3 4 5 6 7 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 8 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE 9 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, 10 NO. CR04-172C CR04-173C Plaintiff, 11 GOVERNMENT'S SENTENCING 12 v. **MEMORANDUM** GB ENTERPRISES, INC., and 13 ALPHA TECHNOLOGIES, INC. 14 Defendants. 15 16 The United States of America, by and through John McKay, United States Attorney for the Western District of Washington, and Robert Westinghouse and Susan 17 Loitz, Assistant United States Attorneys for said District, hereby submits this Sentencing 18 Memorandum in the above-entitled case. 19 20 Alpha Technologies, Inc. ("ATI") and G.B. Enterprises, Inc. ("GBE") are separate legal entities with intertwined businesses interests, a number of shared 21 employees, and leaders – Fred Kaiser and Grace Borsari – so close as to be co-signers 22 23 on joint bank accounts. The two corporate leaders have also been long-standing partners in a single-minded desire to avoid the payment of almost all taxes including federal 24 income taxes. This obsession has led them year after year to systematically shift income 25

from business to business within the Alpha corporate empire to avoid having such

income stuck on the corporate books where it might be noticed by the Internal Revenue

26

27

28

Service.

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

The corporate felony tax fraud convictions that are subject of these plea agreements focus on their specific efforts to reduce their corporate tax liability by artificially inflating business expenses through the purported payment of commissions or fees to a related Canadian Alpha entity, Alpha Technologies, Ltd. ("ATL"). This scheme, which has been accurately detailed in the presentence report, involved the movement of money offshore to either the Grand Caymans or to Cyprus, two noted taxhavens, in the form of residual commissions left over after ATI, the service entity, paid the regional sales representatives their commissions for the marketing of uninterruptible power sources and related items manufactured by GBE. Over an approximate ten year period, GBE escaped paying more that \$19 Million in taxes on diverted income of more than \$51 million.

If the case was ever tried, the corporations, through their leaders, Mr. Kaiser and Ms. Borsari, would undoubtedly claim that these offshore payments were actually appropriate payments to Mr. Kaiser for services provided or work performed. The record belies this claim. First, during the prolonged civil examination and more recently during the extended criminal investigation, no one rushed forward to acknowledge that such payments were even being made. Indeed, the party line has been that the residual commissions were paid to the Canadian affiliate, ATL, pursuant to a 1980 agreement that provided for the payments to ATL to maintain a regional sales network. Furthermore, those willing to carry the corporate bags for Mr. Kaiser, particularly a former Chief Financial Officer who is particularly loyal to Mr. Kaiser, claimed that the funds shipped off to ATL were duly reported to the Canadian Department of Revenue.

The story began to unravel only when the skeptical IRS examiner, who refused to accept what he was being told, uncovered evidence of wire transfers to offshore entities. However, even when confronted with the first evidence of checks written to Alphatec, Ltd, another Fred Kaiser controlled Alpha entity in Cyprus, this loyalist feigned ignorance about even the existence of an entity called Alphatec. Later in the

3 4 5

10

6

7

8

12 13

11

15 16

14

18 19

17

21 22

23

20

24 25

26 27

28

linvestigation, additional corporate agreements – heretofore unmentioned -- were produced. One of these agreements was presented by the Alpha businesses as providing a logical basis for the offshore transfers, this time as some sort of royalty payments owed for intellectual property. Additionally, Mr. Kaiser sought to impede and obstruct the investigation urging one witness, a possible suitor interesting in buying ATI, GBE, and other Alpha businesses, to resist a grand jury subpoena for records.

In the face of such strong evidence of criminal tax fraud and obstructionist behavior, the obvious question is whether justice is served by the corporate plans and specific sentences contemplated in the Plea Agreements. Our answer is an unequivocal, "Yes!"

The corporate pleas are a compromise. There is no doubt that strong arguments can be made that a number of individuals, most notably Fred Kaiser, might be prosecuted. For more than twenty years, he has taken advantage of the American business environment to build a very profitable business while almost entirely avoiding the payment of taxes.

Unfortunately, it would be of little consequence to charge him with tax violations or with conspiracy to obstruct justice because he appears to live in Cyprus and in the Bahamas, two countries from which extradition is most unlikely. Information provided to federal law enforcement agents suggests that he has not been in this country in almost a year. One suspects that he intends to remain outside the jurisdiction indefinitely if charges are forthcoming.

Prosecution of others implicated in the investigation is unattractive for either of two reasons. First, their culpability pales in comparison to that of the ultimate boss. Second, the absence of Mr. Kaiser from their trial would allow them to shift all of the blame to him and claim that they were only relying on his directions.

Finally, prosecution of any of these individuals would almost certainly encounter a stiff defense premised on the argument that they relied on the advice of counsel and that the residual commissions genuinely constituted ordinary and necessary business

expenses for GBE. In fact, the investigation made clear that numerous legal and accounting professionals did advise the businesses from time to time, although it is far from clear that any of them received truthful information on which to base their advice. 3 Moreover, counsel for Mr. Kaiser has repeatedly contended that Mr. Kaiser is an 4 integral part of the Alpha sales force and is fairly entitled to compensation for his 5 services. 6 Balanced against this set of possible individual criminal prosecutions and the 7 inherent factual challenges, is a settlement that extracts much from the two corporations. 8 It includes corporate felony pleas, statutory maximum fines without the complications of 9 the alternative fine provision, and a dollar for dollar repayment of back taxes, plus 10 interest and penalties, which have the effect of almost doubling the total bill. In the end, 11 the tax base of this country is increased by \$35.5 million. 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28

1	Under all of the circumstances, the Internal Revenue Service and the United
2	States Department of Justice think this is a good deal. We respectfully urge the Court to
3	accept it.
4	Dated this 18th day of June, 2004.
5	Respectfully submitted,
6	Respectfully submitted,
7	/s/Robert Westinghouse ROBERT WESTINGHOUSE
8	Assistant United States Attorney WSBA #6484
9	United States Attorney's Office 601 Union Street, Suite 5100
10	Seattle, Washington 98101-3903 Telephone: (206) 553-4750
11	Fax No.: (206) 553-2502 E-mail: <u>Robert.Westinghouse@usdoj.gov</u>
12	
13	/s/Susan Loitz
14	SUSAN LOITZ Assistant United States Attorney
15	WSBA #14061 United States Attorney's Office
16 17	601 Union Street, Suite 5100 Seattle, Washington 98101-3903
18	Telephone: (206) 553-2275 Fax No.: (206) 553-2502 E-mail: Susan.Loitz@usdoj.gov
19	E-man. Susan. Lonz@usdoj.gov
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	

27

28

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE 1 I hereby certify that on June 18, 2004, I electronically filed the foregoing with 2 the Clerk of Court using the CM/ECF system which will send notification of such filing 3 to the attorneys of record for the defendants. I hereby certify that I have served the 4 attorneys of record for the defendants that are non CM/ECF participants via telefax. 5 6 7 s/Anna Chang ANNA CHANG Paralegal 8 United States Attorney's Office 601 Union Street, Suite 5100 9 Seattle, Washington 98101-3903 Telephone: (206) 553-2274 10 Fax No.: (206) 553-2502 E-mail: Ànna. Chang@usdoj. gov 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27

28